

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-29 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 7, 10-12, 18, 21, 27 are amended. Support for the amended claims can be found on page 12 lines 25-28 and page 13 lines 22-26. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation**

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-6, 10, 12, 15-17, 21, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *McDonough et al.*, Controlling Access to Information, U.S. Patent No. 5,991,878 (November 23, 1999) (hereinafter "*McDonough*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts the following:

Referring to claim 1,

McDonough teaches a method in a data processing system for managing access to a set of applications associated with a universal resource locator (Fig. 1, col. 2, line 48-52), the method comprising:

receiving a request, wherein the request includes the universal resource locator (col. 2, line 58-61, col. 3, line 15-20) and a user identification (col. 3, line 39-44, col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 6) ; and

directing the request to a selected application within the set of applications using the universal resource locator and the user identification. (col.5, line 7-30).

Office action dated September 07, 2006 pages 2-3.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). All limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Anticipation focuses on whether a claim reads on the product or process a prior art reference discloses, not on what the reference broadly teaches. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 U.S.P.Q. 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In this case each and every feature of the presently claimed invention is not identically shown in the cited reference, arranged as they are in the claims. Claim 1 is as currently amended is as follows:

1. A method in a data processing system for managing access to a set of applications associated with a universal resource locator, the method comprising:
  - receiving a request for a first application from a second application, wherein the request includes the universal resource locator and a user identification;
  - modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application; and

directing the request to a selected application within the set of applications using the modified universal resource locator.

*McDonough* does not anticipate claim 1 as amended because *McDonough* does not teach “modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application” and “directing the request to a selected application within the set of applications using the *modified* universal resource locator.” Instead, *McDonough* teaches a method for controlling access to information in a distributed computing system. The method includes receiving a request for information accompanied by encrypted session state data, such as when provided as a generic cookie. The method also includes, based on the encrypted session state data, determining whether to pass the request to a source of the information. The source can be a server computer. (*McDonough*, col. 1, lines 34-41).

Furthermore, *McDonough* receives a URL-based request for information from the browser software. The request includes a data packet made up of the URL and other computer data. (*McDonough*, col. 3, lines 15-18). Based on the request, a set of application software instances is identified. (*McDonough*, col. 5, lines 7-8). Based on the authorized application codes and the authorized realm indicator, derived from the smart cookie, the process determines whether the user is authorized to have access to the identified set. For example, the authorized realm indicator may include “/test” and the authorized applications codes may include “GH” and “IJ”. In such a case, if the URL includes “/working/GH”, the authorized realm indicator blocks access to a corresponding “GH” application software instance even though the authorized applications codes include “GH”. If the user is not authorized to have access, the browser software is provided with a response indicating that access is denied. (*McDonough*, col. 5, lines 15-26).

As shown in the above portion of *McDonough*, *McDonough* does not teach modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification. *McDonough* receives a universal resource locator and a cookie. Based off the cookie, *McDonough* determines whether the user is authorized to have access to the identified set associated with the universal resource locator. *McDonough* does not teach “modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application.”

Furthermore, because *McDonough* does not modify the universal resource locator based on the user identification, *McDonough* inherently cannot direct the request to a selected application within the set of applications using the *modified* universal resource locator. Consequently, *McDonough* does not teach this claimed feature. Therefore, again, *McDonough* does not anticipate claim 1 as amended.

Because claims 10, 12, and 21 have been amended with similar language as that presented in claim 1 as amended, the same distinctions between *McDonough* vis-à-vis claim 1 apply to claims 10, 12, and 21. Therefore, *McDonough* also does not anticipate claims 10, 12, and 21.

Because claims 4-6, 15-17, and 24-26 depend from either claim 1, 12, and 21, the same distinctions between *McDonough* and the claimed invention in claims 1, 12, and 21, apply to these claims. Additionally, claims 4-6, 15-17, and 24-26 claim other additional combinations of features not suggested by the reference.

For example, *McDonough* does not teach *replacing* the selected application with a new selected application as recited in claim 4. The Examiner asserts otherwise citing the following portion of *McDonough*:

Otherwise, based on the application-specific data (e.g., indicating "AB2" in FIG. 3) derived from the smart cookie, the gatekeeper determines a specific application software instance (e.g., instance 34) for processing the request (step 1150). The application-specific data may lack an indication of a specific instance (e.g., because the request is the session's first involving a particular type of application software instance). If so, the instance is selected according to a load-balancing strategy and is noted for future reference in application-specific data provided in an updated smart cookie that accompanies a substantive response to the request, as described below.

*McDonough*, col. 5, lines 27-39.

The above portion does not teach *replacing* the selected application with a new selected application. *McDonough* selects the specific application software instance indicated in the smart cookie. If there is no instance indicated in the smart cookie, for example because the request is the session's first, then the instance is selected according to a load-balancing strategy. *McDonough* does not *replace* a selected application with a new selected application. Therefore, *McDonough* does not teach the additional features of claim 4.

## **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness**

### **II.A. Claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 22, and 23**

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *McDonough* in view of *Levergood et al.*, Internet Server Access Control and Monitoring Systems, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0095526 (May 4, 2006) (hereinafter "*Levergood*.") This rejection is respectfully traversed. Regarding claim 2, the Examiner states:

Referring to claims 2 and 3,

Keeping in mind the teachings of *McDonough*, *McDonough* specifically fails to teach the method of claim 1, wherein the user identification is an internet Protocol address of a node originating the request, and the method of claim 1, wherein the user identification is a user name located within the request.

Levergood teaches at para., [0031] If the initial GET URL contains a SID, the content server determines whether the request is directed to a page within the current domain 106.", para.. [0014] In the preferred embodiment, a valid SID allows the client to access all controlled files within a protection domain without requiring further authorization. A protection domain is defined by the service provider and is a collection of controlled files of common protection within one or more servers., para. [0012], "A valid SID typically comprises a user identifier, an accessible domain, a key identifier, an expiration time such as date, the IP address of the user computer, and an unforgeable digital signature such as a cryptographic hash of all of the other items in the SID encrypted with a secret key."

The SID (a session identification ) including these many user data including user name and user's IP address as well as appending the SID to the initial request to control the access to the information would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill, such that it would have been obvious for one in ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the teachings of Levergood's session identification data such as user name and IP address into the McDonough's encrypted session state data provided as a "PRIVATE cookie.

It would have been obvious because the SID allows the user to access specific document with the identification of knowing exactly who the client is and what it's IP address is as taught by Levergood.

Office action dated September 07, 2006 pages 6-7.

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against claim 2 as amended, using the cited references, because the proposed combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 2 as amended. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993). All limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994). In the case at hand, the teachings of the references themselves do not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Claim 2 is as follows:

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the user identification is an Internet Protocol address of a node originating the request.

The Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against claim 2 using the present references because neither *McDonough* nor *Levergood* teach or suggest all features of claim 1, from which claim 2 depends. As discussed above, *McDonough* does not teach the claimed feature, "modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application." Because *McDonough* does not teach any type of modification to the universal resource locator entered by the user, *McDonough* also does not suggest the features of claim 1.

Furthermore, *Levergood* also does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. *Levergood* relates to methods for controlling and monitoring access to network servers. *Levergood* teaches forwarding a service request (URL) from the client to the server and appending a session identification (SID) to the request and to subsequent service requests from the client to the server within a session of requests (*Levergood*, paragraph 0011, lines 6-10). However, *Levergood* does not teach “modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application” as recited in claim 1. *Levergood* specifically states the browser on the client computer executes a relative link by rewriting the current URL to replace the old controlled page name with a new one (*Levergood*, page 2, paragraph 0015, lines 7-11). Because the client's browser rewrites and replaces the old universal resource locator with the new one, *Levergood* also does not suggest the feature, “modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application” as in claim 1.

Because neither *McDonough* nor *Levergood* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1, and because claim 2 depends from claim 1, the proposed combination of *McDonough* and *Levergood* when considered as a whole does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 2. Accordingly, the Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 2 based on the cited references. For the same reason, the Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 3 based on the cited references.

Similarly, because claims 12 and 21 have been amended with identical language as that presented in claim 1, the same distinctions between *McDonough* and claim 1 apply to claims 12 and 21. Because claims 13, 14, 22, and 23 depend from claims 12 and 21, respectively, the Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claims 13, 14, 22, and 23 based on the cited references. Consequently, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 22, and 23 have been overcome.

## **II.B. Claims 7, 11, 18, 27**

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 11, 18, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *McDonough* in view of *Labarge et al.*, Interface for Submitting Richly-Formatted Documents for Remote Processing, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0188435 (December 12, 2002) (hereinafter “*Labarge*.”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Regarding claim 7, the Examiner states:

Referring to claim 7,

*McDonough* teaches a method in a data processing system for managing access to a plurality of applications (col.2, line 48-52, Fig.1 ), the method comprising:

associating the plurality of applications with a first universal resource locator (col. 2, line 53-57);

receiving a request including the first universal resource locator (col. 2, line 58-61, col. 3, line 15-20) and an identification of a user (col. 3, line 39-44, col. 4, line 64- col.5, line 6); and

redirecting the request using the first universal resource locator to a particular application within the plurality of applications using a particular universal resource locator associated with the particular application based on the identification (col.5, line 7-30).

McDonough fails to teach assigning the plurality of applications with plurality of universal resource locators excluding the first universal resource locator.

Labarge teaches at para. [0039, " Preferably, redirection provides flexibility for the URL addresses assigned to various machine translation servers. Only the redirection server URL needs to remain constant for access by the word processing application 21 0, while the machine translation server URLs may be changed from time to time to reflect configuration changes or to reflect changes in available machine translation services. For example, if the ABC Translation Company goes out of business, the URL address for the ABC Translation Company will be removed and/or replaced by the URL of an alternate machine translation service designated for a given translation service, for example, "Japanese to English."

Labarge's teachings would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill, such that it would have been obvious for one in ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement these teachings at the McDonough's web server computer such that the flexibility is achieved in assigning the URL addresses to various application instances with keeping the web server's address (URL) constant and then redirecting the McDonough's application user to the appropriate application instance based on the determination of access authorization.

This would have been obvious because it provides the flexibility wherein application URLs may be changed from time to time , with no user's are affected, and server UL can be kept constant.

Office action dated September 07, 2006 pages 7-8.

The Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection based on the cited references because the proposed combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 7 as amended. In the case at hand, the teachings of the references themselves do not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Claim 7 as amended is as follows:

7. A method in a data processing system for managing access to a plurality of applications, the method comprising:

associating the plurality of applications with a first universal resource locator;

assigning the plurality of applications with plurality of universal resource locators excluding the first universal resource locator;

receiving a request for a first application from a second application, wherein the request includes including the first universal resource locator and an identification of a user; and

modifying the first universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the first universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application; and redirecting the request using the first modified universal resource locator to a particular application within the plurality of applications.

The Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection based on the cited references because neither *McDonough* nor *Labarge* teach or suggest all features of claim 7 as amended. As discussed above, *McDonough* does not teach or suggest the claimed feature, “modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application.”

Additionally, *Labarge* also does not teach or suggest this claimed feature. *Labarge* provides an application programming interface (API) for submitting a richly-formatted text selection or document to a remote machine translation server for translation. The user's software application program, such as a word processor, requests from a redirector server the uniform resource locator (URL) of a remote machine translation server. All formatting, images, including pictures, drawings and the like, and other data objects not requiring translation are saved in a temporary file on the user's computer. The user's word processing software application opens an instance of the user's Internet browser, and the Internet browser submits the text selection to the remote machine translation server via the Internet, an intranet, or other distributed computing environment (*Labarge*, paragraph 0007).

More particularly, once the user selects a translation service, for example, “Japanese to English”, a redirection request is sent from the word processing application to a redirection server. The purpose for the redirection request is to obtain the URL for the particular translation service selected by the user, for example, “Japanese to English” (*Labarge*, paragraph 0038).

Thus, *Labarge* does not teach “modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application” as in claim 7 as amended. Instead, *Labarge* teaches a software application program requesting a URL from a redirector server based on the translation service selected by the user. *Labarge* does not modify a universal resource locator *based on the user identification* because *Labarge* selects a URL based on the translation service selected by the user and not by the user identification. Because *Labarge* does not teach the above feature, *Labarge* also does not suggest the feature, “modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application” as in claim 7 as amended.

Because neither *McDonough* nor *Labarge* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 7 as amended, the proposed combination of *McDonough* and *Labarge* when considered as a whole does not

teach or suggest all of the features of claim 7 as amended. Accordingly, the Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 7 as amended based on the cited references.

Similarly, because claims 11, 18, and 27 have been amended with identical language as that presented in claim 7 as amended, the same distinctions between *McDonough* and *Labarge* vis-à-vis claim 7 apply to claims 11, 18, and 27. Accordingly, the Examiner also cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 11, 18, and 27 based on the cited references. Consequently, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of claims 7, 11, 18, and 27 have been overcome.

## **II.C. Claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 28, and 29**

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *McDonough* in view of *Labarge* as applied to claim 7, and further in view of *Levergood*. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Regarding claim 8, the Examiner states:

Referring to claim 8 and 9,

Keeping in mind the teachings of *McDonough* *Labarge*, both of these references fail to teach the method of claim 7, wherein the identification is an internet Protocol address, and the method of claim 7, wherein the identification is a user name.

*Levergood* teaches at para., [0031] If the initial GET URL contains a SID, the content server determines whether the request is directed to a page within the current domain 106.11, para.. [0014] In the preferred embodiment, a valid SID allows the client to access all controlled files within a protection domain without requiring further authorization. A protection domain is defined by the service provider and is a collection of controlled files of common protection within one or more servers., para. [0012], "A valid SID typically comprises a user identifier, an accessible domain, a key identifier, an expiration time such as date, the IP address of the user computer, and an unforgeable digital signature such as a cryptographic hash of all of the other items in the SID encrypted with a secret key. "

The SID (a session identification ) including these many user data including user name and user's IP address as well as appending the SID to the initial request to control the access to the information would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill, such that it would have been obvious for one in ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the teachings of *Levergood*'s session identification data such as user name and IP address into the *McDonough*'s encrypted session state data , provided as a "PRIVATE cookie.

It would have been obvious because the SID allows the user to access specific document with the identification of knowing exactly who the client is and what it's IP address is as taught by *Levergood*.

Office action dated September 07, 2006 pages 9-10.

Regarding claim 8, the Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection because the proposed combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 7 as amended, from which



claim 8 depends. In the case at hand, the teachings of the references themselves do not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Claim 8 is as follows:

8. The method of claim 7, wherein the identification is an Internet Protocol address.

The Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection using the cited references because neither *McDonough* nor *Labarge* teach or suggest all features of claim 7 as amended. Specifically, as discussed above, neither *McDonough* nor *Labarge* teach or suggest the claimed feature, “modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application,” in claim 7.

Additionally, as shown above, *Levergood* also does not suggest the feature, “modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application” as in claim 7 as amended.

Because neither *McDonough*, *Labarge*, nor *Levergood* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 7 as amended, and because claim 8 depends from claim 7, the proposed combination of *McDonough*, *Labarge*, and *Levergood* when considered as a whole does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 8. Accordingly, the Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 8 using the cited references. For the same reason, the Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 9 using the cited references.

Similarly, because claims 18 and 27 have been amended with similar language to that presented in claim 7 as amended, the same distinctions between *McDonough*, *Labarge*, and *Levergood* vis-à-vis claim 7 apply to claims 18 and 27. Because claims 19, 20, 28, and 29 depend from claims 18 and 27, respectively, the Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claims 19, 20, 28, and 29 using the cited references. Consequently, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 28, and 29 has been overcome.

### III. Conclusion

The subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: December 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Theodore D. Fay III/

Theodore D. Fay III  
Reg. No. 48,504  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants

TDF/nh